

REMARKS

Favorable reconsideration of this application in light of the following remarks is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-11 as originally filed remain active in this case.

In the outstanding Official Action, Claim 1-3, 6, 7, 9 and 11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Fogel (WO 01/50151), Claims 4, 5, 8 and 10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fogel in view of Schmidt et al. (U.S. Patent No. 20043/0056798).

Applicants respectfully traverse the several grounds for rejection because in Applicants' view, the pending claims patentably define over the cited prior art for the reasons next discussed.

In particular, the outstanding Official Action states the position that Fogel discloses each of the claimed features of the apparatus recited in Claim 1, including the "the location information providing unit configured to figure a location of said wireless base stations using the detected present location of said apparatus stored in said storing unit and to provide the figure location of said wireless base stations" recited in the last paragraph of Claim 1. Applicants respectfully disagree.

On the contrary, Fogel discloses that Bluetooth base station 54 and cellular phone 61 communicate with each other (See Fig. 4), and specifically, that the Bluetooth base station 54 transmits its ID number or location data to the cellular phone, detects its location by using GPS signals, etc. (See Fig. 4 and page 15 of Fogel). Further, Fogel discloses that Bluetooth stations 96 are located every 100m in a tunnel 100 and that a vehicle 92 can receive the location data of the Bluetooth stations 96 even when the vehicle 92 cannot receive the GPS signals in the tunnel 100. (See Fig. 10 and page 20 of Fogel).

Application No. 10/715,395
Reply to Office Action of September 6, 2005

However, Fogel fails to disclose or suggest that a location of the wireless base stations is calculated using the detected present location of the apparatus and the calculated present locations then provided.

In that regard, Applicants acknowledge the finding in the Official Action that page 20 of Fogel discloses that current position is displayed in correlation to wireless base stations' locations. However, Fogel teaches display of the current position of the vehicle, but does not teach providing the location of the base stations.

In the invention defined by Claim 1, in order to allow users to easily obtain the wireless communication information in a given area, the location information of the base station is provided. In contrast, it is not necessary for Fogel to display the location information of the base stations because the object of Fogel is to detect the location of moving vehicles. In view of this distinction, it is respectfully submitted that Fogel clearly does not teach the "the location information providing unit" of Claim 1 and that Claims 1-8 therefore patentably define over Fogel.

Regarding Claims 9-11, from the above discussion it is believed to be clear that Fogel fails to disclose or suggest providing map information indication information of the figured location of the wireless base stations. Therefore, Claims 9-11 are also believed to be patentably distinguishing over Fogel.

Applicants have also considered the Schmidt et al. reference, but Schmidt et al. is not believed to cure the deficiencies of Fogel, and thus Claims 1-11 are believed to be allowable over the cited prior art.

Accordingly, no further issues are believed to be outstanding, and the present

Application No. 10/715,395

Reply to Office Action of September 6, 2005

application is believed to be in condition for formal allowance. An early and favorable action to that effect is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



Eckhard H. Kuesters
Attorney of Record
Registration No. 28,870

Customer Number

22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000

Fax: (703) 413 -2220

(OSMMN 06/04)

I:\ATTY\EHK\AMEND-RESPONSES\0039\24s\245452US-REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION.DOC